


SLEEP LATENCY AND DURATION OF SLEEP STUDY A




#: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO;

&: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN DPH.

NOTE: ALL TESTING WERE DONE AT 0.075 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

FIG. 1


NURSE OBSERVED SLEEP LATENCY STUDY A



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
 DDD: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN DPH AT 0.001 LEVEL

FIG. 2


MEAN SPRID3 SCORES STUDY A



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
 DDD: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN DPH AT 0.001 LEVEL

FIG. 3

CUMULATIVE PERCENT ASLEEP STUDY A




#: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO;

&: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN DPH.

NOTE: ALL TESTING WERE DONE AT 0.075 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

FIG. 4

DURATION OF SLEEP STUDY B




#: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO

\$: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU 400 mg

FIG. 5


CUMULATIVE % OF SUBJECTS ASLEEP AT 60 MIN



pp: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.01 LEVEL
pp: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.01 LEVEL
(BUT TECHNICALLY INELIGIBLE)

FIG. 6

MEAN SPRID2 SCORES STUDY B



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
 ppp: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
 (BUT TECHNICALLY INELIGIBLE)

FIG. 7

SLEEP LATENCY STUDY B





FIG. 8


EASE OF FALLING ASLEEP STUDY B



NOTE: OF THE 122 ITT SUBJECTS IN THE IBU400/DPH50 GROUP, 1 SUBJECT HAD MISSING DATA AND DATA FROM AN ADDITIONAL 3 SUBJECTS WERE CONSIDERED MISSING FOR THE PURPOSE OF ANALYSIS

FIG. 9

GLOBAL EVALUATION OF STUDY MEDICATION AS A SLEEP-AID STUDY A



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL.

NOTE: OF THE 122 ITT SUBJECTS IN THE IBU400/DPH50 GROUP, 1 SUBJECT HAD MISSING DATA AND DATA FROM AN ADDITIONAL 3 SUBJECTS WERE CONSIDERED MISSING FOR THE PURPOSE OF ANALYSIS

FIG. 10

MEAN PRID SCORES STUDY B





FIG. 11

GLOBAL EVALUATION OF STUDY MEDICATION AS A PAIN RELIEVER STUDY B




PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL

NOTE: OF THE 122 ITT SUBJECTS IN THE IBU400/DPH50 GROUP, 1 SUBJECT HAD MISSING DATA AND DATA FROM AN ADDITIONAL 3 SUBJECTS WERE CONSIDERED MISSING FOR THE PURPOSE OF ANALYSIS

FIG. 12



TIME TO RESCUE MEDICATION
STUDY C



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL

FIG. 13

DURATION OF SLEEP STUDY C




#: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO

\$: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU 400 mg

FIG. 14


CUMULATIVE % OF SUBJECTS ASLEEP AT 60 MIN
STUDY C



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL

FIG. 15

MEAN SPRID2 SCORES STUDY C



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
C: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBUPROFEN 400 mg/DIPHENHYDRAMINE
HYDROCHLORIDE 50 mg COMBINATION AT 0.05 LEVEL

FIG. 16

SLEEP LATENCY
KAPLAN MEIER CURVES
STUDY C





FIG. 17

SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO

EASE OF FALLING ASLEEP STUDY C



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL

FIG. 18

GLOBAL EVALUATION OF STUDY MEDICATION AS A SLEEP-AID STUDY C





FIG. 19

MEAN PRID SCORES STUDY C



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
C: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBUPROFEN 400 mg/DIPHENHYDRAMINE
HYDROCHLORIDE 50 mg COMBINATION AT 0.05 LEVEL

FIG. 20

GLOBAL EVALUATION OF STUDY MEDICATION AS A PAIN RELIEVER STUDY C




FIG. 21

TIME TO RESCUE MEDICATION
KAPLAN MEIER CURVES
STUDY C





FIG. 22


DURATION OF SLEEP STUDY D



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
L: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU200/DPH25 AT 0.05 LEVEL

FIG. 23

CUMULATIVE % OF SUBJECTS ASLEEP AT 60 MIN
STUDY D




PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL

FIG. 24

EURO 2000


MEAN SPRID2 SCORES
STUDY D



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
L: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU200/DPH25 AT 0.05 LEVEL (BUT TECHNICALLY INELIGIBLE)

FIG. 25


MEAN PRID SCORES STUDY D



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
L: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU200/DPH25 AT 0.05 LEVEL


FIG. 26

GLOBAL EVALUATION OF STUDY MEDICATION AS A PAIN RELIEVER STUDY D



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
L: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU200/DPH25 AT 0.05 LEVEL

FIG. 27




PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL

III: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU400mg AT 0.001 LEVEL

*OF THE 241 ITT SUBJECTS IN THE IBU400/DP50 GROUP, 1 SUBJECT HAD MISSING DATA AND DATA FROM AN ADDITIONAL 3 SUBJECTS WERE CONSIDERED MISSING FOR THE PURPOSE OF ANALYSIS (THESE 4 SUBJECTS ARE FROM STUDY B)

FIG. 28



PPP: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN PLACEBO AT 0.001 LEVEL
 L: SIGNIFICANTLY BETTER THAN IBU400mg AT 0.05 LEVEL

FIG. 29